

628



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/934,678      | 08/23/2001  | Kazuhito Gassho      | 110466              | 8387             |

7590 02/22/2006  
Peter B. Martine  
MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP  
710 Lakeway Drive  
Suite 170  
Sunnyvale, CA 25920

| EXAMINER |
|----------|
|----------|

DIVINE, LUCAS

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2624

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   |                               |                               |  |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Advisory Action</b><br><b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b> | Application No.<br>09/934,678 | Applicant(s)<br>GASSHO ET AL. |  |
|   | Examiner<br>Lucas Divine      | Art Unit<br>2625              |  |

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 06 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-16 and 18-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☒ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attachment.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.



KING Y. POON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2/6/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's arguments on page 7 that there is no teaching in the Mori reference that a selective holder refrains from holding the printing job in the auxiliary memory device even if the set portion is set so that the printing job is still held in the auxiliary memory device when the judging portion judges that the printing job is set to have some secret.

In reply, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Mori teaches the selective holder and Nosaki teaches the set portion (see final rejection pages 5-7). The combination includes both the selective holder and the set portion. So, while Mori does not teach the set portion as recited above, the combination does teach both combined.

With respect to applicant's arguments on page 8 that Nosaki does not teach that the print system does not hold the printer data after the printing operation when the print data is for a secret printing operation.

In reply, Examiner agrees, but points to Mori, which does teach this in col. 6 lines 25-32 as cited in the rejection. Thus, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the

Art Unit: 2625

rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

With respect to applicant's arguments on pages 8-9 that there would have been no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of the Nosaki reference into the print system of Mori.

Mori does not currently have a global setting like that of Nosaki, that allows the user to set a mode that allows the saving of all jobs vs. not saving jobs. Thus, Nosaki can add an advantage to that of Mori. Further, since each reference allows users to control the memory management of print jobs in different and advantageous ways, both the comprehensive and the secret determinations would be beneficial in a single system. Thus, it would have been obvious to add the comprehensive mode of Nosaki to the printing system of Mori. This would create two steps, one that checks whether or not a memory mode is set and one to check if the document was secret, and proceeding as each of the patents teach. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to save all jobs (without having to select the option in each and every job) for reprinting but also to make sure that secret data stays that way and isn't stored in the memory for others to see or view. Thus, more precise control for the user with minimal work is attained.

  
KING Y. POON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER